

“Cherry-Picking” Patients for Randomized, Controlled Trials—Reliving the Past...

We read with interest the VA CARDS (Veterans Affairs Coronary Artery Revascularization in Diabetes) study (1) comparing percutaneous coronary intervention (PCI) and coronary artery bypass grafting (CABG) in subjects with diabetes. In our opinion, the most notable finding of the study is not the outcome of the trial, but the actual study design itself, that is, the stringent angiography- and clinically based inclusion and exclusion criteria, which makes application of the study's findings to real-world contemporary clinical practice highly questionable. Notably, of the 6,678 diabetic patients screened for this study, a staggering 6,080/6,678 (91%) of screened subjects did not meet angiographic requirements for the study, and only 198 subjects (3%) were randomly assigned to either CABG ($n = 97$, 1.5%) or PCI with drug-eluting stents (DESs) ($n = 101$, 1.5%) and completed the 2-year follow-up. Such a trial design is reminiscent of the PCI versus CABG randomized trials undertaken before the SYNTAX (Synergy Between PCI With Taxus and Cardiac Surgery) trial (2,3), where “cherry-picking” of patients before randomization was a major confounding issue (2% to 12% of screened patients were randomized in most trials) that effectively invalidated the results of these trials (4,5). The SYNTAX trial was designed to overcome these limitations by incorporating an all-comers design in which practically no patient was refused entry, with subjects either randomized (if determined by the Heart Team to achieve “equivalent anatomical revascularization” between CABG and PCI) or nested in registries (2,3). This was at the insistence of 7 cardiac surgeons (dubbed the “magnificent 7”) during the design of SYNTAX to prevent selection bias, a view that was fully endorsed by the clinical and interventional cardiologists at the time. To give an example of the potential dangers of using highly selected populations in a clinical trial design, a recent meta-analysis of randomized trials undertaken before SYNTAX comparing PCI with CABG (6) showed CABG to be favored in older subjects and PCI to be favored in younger subjects, findings that have since been directly contradicted by the all-comers SYNTAX trial (where the opposite was shown) (7). In addition, the analyses demonstrating the anatomic SYNTAX score in the VA CARDS study not to show any treatment effect between CABG and PCI warrant specific mention in that they were severely underpowered to draw any conclusions, even if considered hypothesis generating (8). Specifically, the majority of subjects in the VA CARDS study had low (≤ 22) (CABG: $n = 47$ vs. PCI: $n = 59$) SYNTAX scores, with few subjects in the intermediate (23 to 32) (CABG: $n = 33$ vs. PCI: $n = 24$) or high (≥ 33) (CABG: $n = 13$ vs. PCI: $n = 12$) SYNTAX scores, presumably due to the overwhelmingly restrictive angiographic inclusion and exclusion criteria of the study as described earlier, thus making any comparisons of the low with the higher SYNTAX score tertiles practically meaningless. Even within the FREEDOM (Future Revascularization Evaluation in Patients With Diabetes Mellitus: Optimal Management of Multivessel Disease) trial, (9) analyses based on the SYNTAX score tertiles appear to have been limited by power and were contradicted by those reported in the pre-stratified and powered diabetic

subgroup of SYNTAX (10). The real lesson of the VA CARDS study is that randomization of subjects in a clinical trial is not enough and that an all-comers clinical trial design is warranted. Anything less will take us back to the confusing era of randomized trials performed before SYNTAX and will serve to cloud the medical literature.

Vasim Farooq, MBChB

***Patrick W. Serruys, MD, PhD**

*Erasmus Medical Center

's-Gravendijkwal 230

3015 CE Rotterdam

the Netherlands

E-mail: p.w.j.c.serruys@erasmusmc.nl

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jacc.2013.03.018>

Please note: Steven Nissen, MD, served as Guest Editor for this letter.

REFERENCES

1. Kamalesh M, Sharp TG, Tang XC, et al. Percutaneous coronary intervention versus coronary bypass surgery in United States Veterans with diabetes. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2013;61:808–16.
2. Serruys PW, Morice MC, Kappetein AP, et al. Percutaneous coronary intervention versus coronary-artery bypass grafting for severe coronary artery disease. *N Engl J Med* 2009;360:961–72.
3. Mohr FW, Morice MC, Kappetein AP, et al. Coronary artery bypass graft surgery versus percutaneous coronary intervention in patients with three-vessel disease and left main coronary disease: 5-year follow-up of the randomised, clinical SYNTAX trial. *Lancet* 2013; 381:629–38.
4. Taggart DP, Thomas B. Ferguson Lecture. Coronary artery bypass grafting is still the best treatment for multivessel and left main disease, but patients need to know. *Ann Thorac Surg* 2006;82:1966–75.
5. Taggart DP. CABG or stents in coronary artery disease: end of the debate?. *Lancet* 2013;381:605–7.
6. Flather M, Rhee JW, Boothroyd DB, et al. The effect of age on outcomes of coronary artery bypass surgery compared with balloon angioplasty or bare-metal stent implantation among patients with multivessel coronary disease. A collaborative analysis of individual patient data from 10 randomized trials. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2012;60: 2150–7.
7. Farooq V, van Klaveren D, Steyerberg EW, et al. Anatomical and clinical characteristics to guide decision making between coronary artery bypass surgery and percutaneous coronary intervention for individual patients: development and validation of SYNTAX score II. *Lancet* 2013;381:639–50.
8. Ellis SG. Coronary revascularization for patients with diabetes: updated data favor coronary artery bypass grafting. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2013;61:817–9.
9. Farkouh ME, Domanski M, Sleeper LA, et al. Strategies for multivessel revascularization in patients with diabetes. *N Engl J Med* 2012;367:2375–84.
10. Serruys PW, Farooq V. Revascularization strategies in patients with diabetes. *N Engl J Med* 2013;368:1454–5.

Reply

In the letter about our paper (1), Drs. Farooq and Serruys make the assertion that the VA CARDS (Veterans Affairs Coronary Artery Revascularization in Diabetes) study is not applicable to contemporary coronary revascularization based on: 1) the angiographic inclusion criteria being too strict; 2) the small percentage of screened patients who were enrolled; and 3) that our study was underpowered to evaluate SYNTAX (Synergy Between PCI With Taxus and Cardiac Surgery) scores. The letter completely misses important aspects of our study.